From: Jessica Winter
To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: Re: FW: July 19th Chemical Fate Modeling Presentation Posted
Date: 08/13/2010 01:18 PM

Yes, I agree about using it in a comparative fashion, I just wouldn't put a lot of weight on 0.1 cm/yr vs 0.5 cm/yr deposition rates. I think we're on the same page.

Jessica Winter
NOAA Office of Response and Restoration
7600 Sand Point Way, Bldg 4, Room 2117A
Seattle, WA 98115
Office phone (206) 526-4540
Cell phone (630) 779-4755
Fax (206) 526-6865
jessica.winter@noaa.gov

Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:
> Well, I think that the figure is showing what cells that they applied
> the diagnostics to - demonstrating that a range of erosional and
> depositional cells were considered in the diagnostics. However, I think
> that the figure accurately depicts areas of erosion and deposition at
> the site and that, even though there may be uncertainty in the modeled
> deposition rates, we have concluded that the model is sufficient for use
> in a comparative fashion in the FS.
>
> Eric
>
>
>
> From: Jessica Winter <Jessica.Winter@noaa.gov>
>
> To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
>
> Date: 08/13/2010 12:31 PM
>
> Subject: Re: FW: July 19th Chemical Fate Modeling Presentation Posted
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Hi Eric- Sorry I forgot to copy you on that email. I will remember to do
>
> so in the future.
> I was talking about the accuracy of the model. Yes, as I understand it,
> the predicted deposition rates shown as blue, green, yellow, and orange
> are within the uncertainty of the model. As I understand it, the
> empirical data used to check the sed model was the bathymetry data with
> an accuracy of about 7.5 cm, measured roughly once/yr, so the model
> can't be assumed to have mm/yr level accuracy, so that level of detail
> on this map is difficult to interpret. Given the model uncertainty,
> essentially everything on this map would be lumped in a single category
> of <7.5 cm/yr except for a few areas within the red sections. But if the
>
> purpose of this figure is just to show whether the diagnostic cells are
> in erosional or depositional areas, then it works fine.
>
> Sorry I had to jump off the TCT early this week-- Michigan oil spill
> stuff came up. I'll be in the office from here on out but working most
> of the time on that, so please just give me a heads up if you need
> anything from NOAA. Thanks.
>
> Jessica Winter
> NOAA Office of Response and Restoration
> 7600 Sand Point Way, Bldg 4, Room 2117A
> Seattle, WA 98115
> Office phone (206) 526-4540
> Cell phone (630) 779-4755
> Fax (206) 526-6865
> jessica.winter@noaa.gov
>
>
>
> Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:
>
>> Jessica, does this answer your question?
>>
>> I am curious about your comment that the bathymetry was only accurate
>>
> to
>
>> 7.5 cm and the model predictions were generally higher. Are talking
>> about the model output or the accuracy of the model? Looking at the
>> figure in question, the modeled deposition rates seem to be consistent
>> with what we know about the river. Do you agree? Do you think that
>>
> the
>
>> predicted sediment deposition are within the error margin of the
>> modeling output and thus are highly uncertain?
>>
>> One final thing, please copy me on any future questions sent to LWG

>> representatives.
>>
>> Thanks, Eric
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>>   From: "Michael Werth" <mwerth@anchorqea.com>
>>
>
>
>
>
>>   To: "Jessica Winter" <Jessica.Winter@noaa.gov>
>>
>
>
>
>
>>   Cc: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Chip
>>
> Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "Carl Stivers" <cstivers@anchorqea.com>,
> "Kevin
>
>>   Russell" <krussell@anchorqea.com>, "Jennifer Woronets"
>>
> <jworonets@anchorqea.com>
>
>
>
>>   Date: 08/13/2010 05:21 AM
>>
>
>
>
>
>>   Subject: RE: FW: July 19th Chemical Fate Modeling Presentation
>>
> Posted
>
>
>
>>
>>
>>
>> Hi Jessica - sorry for the delay in getting back to you. The sole
>> purpose of Slide 32 in the presentation was a setup for the diagnostic
>> charts. It shows the location of the cells selected for diagnostics,
>> and whether or not a particular cell is located in a net deposition or
>> net erosion area. The sedimentation rates shown on this figure are
>> those predicted by the sediment transport model, which is why you see
>> such a high level of precision in the values. Also, as you noted, we
>> have called out many more cells on this figure than the six diagnostic
>> cells we focused on during the presentation. The reason we did that
>>
> was
>
>> because we had diagnostic plots ready for all of these (beyond the six
>> we actually showed during the meeting) in case Earl wanted to see
>>
> them,
>
>> which he said he didn't.
>>
>> Hopefully this answers your questions. As you know, EPA has approved
>> the calibration we showed during the meeting and directed us to move
>> forward with actually using the model, which is underway. If you have
>> any other clarifying questions, just let me know.
>>
>> Mike
>>
>>
>> Michael J. Werth
>> ANCHOR QEA, LLC
>> mwerth@anchorqea.com
>> This electronic message transmission contains information that may be
>> confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation
>>
> of
>
>> litigation. The information is intended for the use of the individual
>> or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please
>>
> be
>
>> aware that any disclosure, copying distribution or use of the contents
>> of this information is prohibited. If you have received this
>>
> electronic
>
>> transmission in error, please notify us by telephone at (206)
>>
> 287-9130.
>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Jessica Winter [mailto:Jessica.Winter@noaa.gov]
>> Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 5:34 PM
>> To: Jennifer Woronets; Michael Werth
>> Subject: Re: FW: July 19th Chemical Fate Modeling Presentation Posted

>>
>> Hi Mike
>> Just following up-- if you already responded, I may have lost your
>>
> email
>
>> since I have been swamped recently (I got detailed to the Kalamazoo
>> River oil spill). If that's the case, could you please resend? Thanks
>>
>> Jessica Winter
>> NOAA Office of Response and Restoration
>> 7600 Sand Point Way, Bldg 4, Room 2117A
>> Seattle, WA 98115
>> Phone (206) 526-4540
>> Fax (206) 526-6865
>> jessica.winter@noaa.gov
>>
>>
>>
>> Jennifer Woronets wrote:
>>
>>
>>> Mike,
>>>
>>> Please see below question from Jessica.
>>>
>>> Thank you,
>>> Jen Woronets ☺
>>> Anchor QEA, LLC
>>> jworonets@anchorqea.com
>>> 1010 NW Flanders, Suite 204
>>> Portland, OR 97209
>>> 503-688-5057 Ext 14
>>>
>>> Please note new address and phone number
>>>
>>>
>>>   Please consider the environment before printing this email.
>>>
>>> The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or
>>>
>>>
>> entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be
>> aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the
>>
> contents
>
>> of this information is prohibited. If you have received this
>>
> electronic
>
>> transmission in error, please notify us by electronic mail at
>> jworonets@anchorqea.com
>>
>>
>>> -----Original Message-----
>>> From: Jessica Winter [mailto:Jessica.Winter@noaa.gov]
>>> Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 3:51 PM
>>> To: Jennifer Woronets
>>> Subject: Re: July 19th Chemical Fate Modeling Presentation Posted
>>>
>>> Thanks Jennifer. I have a question on slide 32 of the main set of
>>> slides. It shows a map of the river color-coded to indicate annual
>>>
> net
>
>>
>>> sedimentation rates. Do you know what this map is based on? (the
>>> sediment transport model or the bathymetry measurements or what?)
>>>
> It's
>
>>
>>> somewhat surprising to me to see such high resolution indicated down
>>>
>>>
>> to
>>
>>
>>> a millimeter per year (0.0-0.1 cm/yr vs. 0.1-0.5 cm/yr vs. 0.5-1.0
>>> cm/yr) when the bathymetry gave data that was only accurate to within
>>> about 7.5 cm and the model predictions were generally higher. I'm
>>>
> also
>
>>
>>> not clear what the outlined grid cells in this map represent-- six of
>>> them are the cells plotted in the diagnostic charts and what are the
>>>
>>>
>> others?
>>
>>
>>> Thank you!
>>>
>>> Jessica Winter
>>> NOAA Office of Response and Restoration
>>> 7600 Sand Point Way, Bldg 4, Room 2117A
>>> Seattle, WA 98115
>>> Phone (206) 526-4540
>>> Fax (206) 526-6865

>>> jessica.winter@noaa.gov
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Jennifer Woronets wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Portland Harbor Managers –
>>>>
>>>> EPA requested a copy of the slides that were used to support
>>>> discussions in the Portland Harbor site July 19th chemical fate
>>>> modeling meeting. The slides have been posted at:
>>>>
>>>> PHCP Files | Documents Under Review | 2010-07-19_LWR Fate and
>>>> Transport Modeling Study Presentation
>>>>
>>>> Please note that the file "LWR_Fate_Model_20100719-1_EPA.pdf" is the
>>>> main set of slides, and the other two files contain information for
>>>> the "Calibration Graphics" and "Diagnostic Charts" sections of the
>>>> discussion.
>>>>
>>>> Please let us know if you have any questions.
>>>>
>>>> Thank you,
>>>>
>>>> Jen Woronets J
>>>>
>>>> Anchor QEA, LLC
>>>>
>>>> jworonets@anchorqea.com
>>>>
>>>> 1010 NW Flanders, Suite 204
>>>>
>>>> Portland, OR 97209
>>>>
>>>> 503-688-5057 Ext 14
>>>>
>>>> ü Please consider the environment before printing this email.
>>>>
>>>> The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or
>>>> entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be
>>>> aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the
>>>> contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received
>>>>
> this
>
>>
>>>> electronic transmission in error, please notify us by electronic
>>>>
> mail
>
>>
>>>> at jworonets@anchorqea.com <mailto:jworonets@anchorenv.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>